



Summary of Task Force and Community Feedback on Key Questions from Task Force Meeting No. 19b – March 9, 2009

Q1 – North Coyote Valley Industrial Park

What amount of growth should be planned for the North Coyote Valley industrial Area?

- (a) Maintain current plan (50,000 jobs)
- (b) Maintain current entitlements only (25,000 jobs)
- (c) Create mixed-use Jobs and Housing Plan (e.g. 50,000 jobs and 25,000 dwelling units)
- (d) No development (Open Space)
- (e) Other (*Please Specify*) _____

Table 1 (facilitated by Joe Horwedel)

- Using the current housing trendline, North Coyote would need to be included as an employment center to achieve a high “jobs per employed resident” ratio (in the range of 1.5 – 2 jobs per employed residents).
- By dropping below the current housing trendline, a “jobs to employed resident” ratio of 1.5 could be achieved while keeping North Coyote as an (industrial) urban reserve and while keeping Mid-Coyote as a non-urban reserve.
- See Question 3 for related scenarios.

Table 2 (facilitated by Nanci Klein)

- Group agreed keep 50,000 jobs, no housing in North Coyote. The group wanted flexibility on the types of businesses. They wanted to accommodate light and heavy industrial and office R&D by allocating certain areas of North Coyote for these types of uses; flexibility was the mantra. They also wanted to accommodate services/warehouse – things like auto body repair, etc. and restaurants to support jobs in the area.
- Multi-modal --- wanted to emphasize the reverse commute. Encouraged a BRT/PRT/LRT be put in place.
- Height, wanted to allow as much height as a company could/would take to encourage density of office/R&D.
- Rail along 101; encourage development of a station along the rail in the area to facilitate non-auto related travel.
- Even though the area would be business oriented, encourage pedestrian activity wherever possible.
- “Road Diets” – make the roads narrower to encourage alternative methods of transportation.

Table 3 (facilitated by Andrew Crabtree)

- Look at full range of open space to mixed-use of 25,000 households and 50,000 jobs
- Include 25,000 jobs scenario (current GP)

- Triggers (Coyote Valley should be later)
- Need a lot of job growth before demand for North Coyote Valley
- Employers may want mixed use
- Single-use areas are not desirable
- How does High Speed Rail change landscape?

Table 4 (facilitated by Laurel Prevetti)

- In order to accomplish these scenarios, do we need Coyote Valley?
 - If no, then: A. No Growth
 - If we do, then consider North Coyote Valley: B. 50,000 jobs with some dwelling units; or: C. existing vision of 50,000 jobs in mid/north Coyote Valley and 25,000 dwelling units

Table 5 (facilitated by Hans Larsen)

- Study option of full development with condition of “right development”
- Study option of no development / urban reserve (not “open space”)

Table 6 (facilitated by Stan Ketchum)

- Maintain existing entitlements – 25,000 jobs
 - No housing until next GP Update
 - Edenvale intensification

Table 8 (facilitated by Lee Butler)

- Do we need large campuses for industrial development for future job growth?
- What other areas besides Coyote can accommodate the growth for jobs?
- Spread jobs throughout City rather than in North Coyote Valley
- Lots of infrastructure needs in North Coyote Valley
- No new housing
- Majority support no development, if not possible 25,000 jobs only in North Coyote Valley and relocate 25,000 into other areas of the City

Q2 – Light/Heavy Industrial Lands

How/Where should the City plan to accommodate new Light/Heavy Industrial Job growth?

If the City converts existing Industrial Park (R&D/Office) areas (e.g., Alviso, North San Jose, International Business Park, Edenvale, Evergreen, North Coyote) to Light/Heavy Industrial use, which areas should be considered?

Table 1 (facilitated by Joe Horwedel)

- No discussion.

Table 2 (facilitated by Nanci Klein)

- Very supportive of adding LI/HI in a variety of places. The group did not specify an amount – simply stated it is desirable to accommodate as much LI/HI as possible.
- Coyote, WPCP buffer lands “book ends” Move the more noxious uses out of the center of the City and “book end” the City with these types of uses. (Wanted to make sure such LI/HI did not come too close to Aliviso.) Group was fine with outer portions of NSJ and or IBP as areas for more LI/HI. The group was fine with including asphalt/batch plant type of heavy/noxious development in these areas.
- The group was interested in “swapping land” from Mid-Town or other neighborhood areas in the process to free up other, “in fill” areas for neighborhood/pedestrian-oriented activities.
- Evergreen – group wanted to leave the development for Office/R&D – not housing, but not LI/HI either.

Table 3 (facilitated by Andrew Crabtree)

- Alviso (low cost, near Water Pollution Control Plant)
- Edenvale (near freeway)
- Question demand for manufacturing given labor costs in 2040
- Freeway underpasses, railroads
- Not FMC

Table 4 (facilitated by Laurel Prevetti)

- Near freight rail
- Near freeways (especially 101 and along 880)
- Consider IP as a transition between LI/HI and housing on previous industrial land
- Northern part of San José better since it doesn’t have a high water table
- Protect these lands; stick to it

Table 5 (facilitated by Hans Larsen)

- Preferences for expansion of light/heavy industrial uses are:
 - North San José/Berryessa near 880 corridor
 - Portions of Edenvale
- Look at Alviso as a port community

Table 6 (facilitated by Stan Ketchum)

- Expand around edges of all planned areas
- Keep all planned areas
- N/237 East of Zanker – conversion opportunity
- Find sites where available
- East of 880 Murphy Avenue

Table 8 (facilitated by Lee Butler)

- Areas adjacent to existing LI/HI planned areas
 - Smaller setbacks because fewer sensitive receptors, therefore greater intensification
- LI/HI in Edenvale, Alviso, and North San José
- LI/HI not in Evergreen and not in North Coyote Valley

Q3 – Amount of Jobs and Housing Growth Capacity

- 1) Do the proposed scenarios adequately address how much and how little job growth should be analyzed?
- 2) Do the proposed scenarios adequately address how much and how little housing growth should be analyzed?
- 3) Is the proposed prioritization for growth areas appropriate?

Table 1 (facilitated by Joe Horwedel)

- Consider a scenario with a 1.5 – 2 jobs per employed resident ratio. Use the trendline for housing (90,000), and bump up the number of jobs to reach the desired 1.5 – 2 ratio. North Coyote Valley would be included for the job numbers in this scenario.
- Consider a scenario with a 1.5 jobs per employed resident ratio using only 60,000 new housing units (2,000/year). North Coyote would be an industrial (urban) reserve, and Mid-Coyote Valley would be a non-urban reserve in this scenario. Using 60,000 new housing units, bump up the number of jobs to achieve the desired 1.5:1 jobs to employed resident ratio.
- More generally, the group advocates for more development in Edenvale and North San José, and they advocate for intensification of the villages. The group also assumes growth in home occupation jobs.

Table 2 (facilitated by Nanci Klein)

- The group focused on providing a floor and ceiling for the EIR consultant to study. The floor should take into account a housing number of 90,000 units and then determine a jobs number that would afford the City a one to one ratio with the 90,000 units. The group felt that the larger job numbers may not happen, so they wanted to support a jobs/housing balance upon a more “realistic” set of numbers.
- One Task Force member wanted to have the EIR identify the impacts of housing vs. the environmental impacts of jobs. The Task Force member felt that having that info would better prepare the staff, task force and commissions/council to conduct a “trade offs” analysis.
- The group was fine with the “jobs surplus” as the upper ceiling – even though they may not be realistic numbers that will be attained, all agreed it’s a good idea to study the “ceiling” to understand the maximum impacts likely.
- The group also thought the other scenarios were okay. They agreed it is valuable to have “middle ground” tests in order to understand associated impacts at those levels.
- Group also thought it would be valuable to have a presentation on SB375, as it looks like the legislation will have impact on future development.

Table 3 (facilitated by Andrew Crabtree)

- Jobs/Employed Resident balance (1.0) is preferred
 - Better community
 - More realistic
 - People connected to community
- Don't create scenario that drives jobs away / grow in way that makes us competitive to attract jobs and keeps cost of living affordable
- Want scenario analysis to include cost of living
- "Jobs Surplus" not realistic, replace with modified "More Jobs / Less Housing" = 137,000 new households and 1.2 Jobs/Employed Resident
- Test 1.2, interesting

Table 4 (facilitated by Laurel Prevetti)

- Mixed Use, real job destinations (driving industry) with housing in viable villages and corridors.
- No Project = 1.1 jobs/employed resident; 229,000 new jobs, 70,000 new dwelling units.
- "Trendline" <1.0 jobs/employed resident; 210,000 new jobs, 96,000 new dwelling units.
- "More Jobs" = 1.0 jobs/employed resident; 334,000 new jobs, 179,000 new dwelling units.
- "Modified More Jobs & Less Housing" = 1.1 jobs/employed resident; 334,000 new jobs, 137,000 new dwelling units (reduce below 137,000). Example: 105,000 new dwelling units, 334,000 new jobs = 1.2 jobs/employed resident.

Table 5 (facilitated by Hans Larsen)

- Job growth range 229,000 to 479,000
- Housing growth range 70,000 to 179,000
- Job/Employed Resident 1.0 to 1.2
- Growth Priority Areas
- Scenarios provide an acceptable range of options

Table 6 (facilitated by Stan Ketchum)

- Strive for fiscal stability
- Remove "Jobs Surplus" scenario
- Modify "More Jobs" scenario to 137,000 households and reduce new jobs to get 1:1 Jobs to Employed Residents ratio.

Table 8 (facilitated by Lee Butler)

- Existing General Plan Jobs/Employed Residents ratio of 1.1 and "More Jobs" scenario reduces the J/ER ratio – should we evaluate that reduction scenario?
- Span between low and high numbers is good for data differentials
- Take North Coyote out of scenarios
- Consider additional housing in Midtown

Q4 – Neighborhood Services – Parks & Open Space

What ideas, concepts or goals would you like the Task Force to consider as we further discuss how to provide Parks and Open Space for current and future residents?

Table 1 (facilitated by Joe Horwedel)

- A major regional park should be included in each corner of the City. No more pocket parks should be pursued.

Table 2 (facilitated by Nanci Klein)

- The group felt strongly that we should move away from the 3.5 standard. Group members understand that the 3.5 is a state specified ratio, but everyone in the group felt frustrated by the standard for a variety of reasons. The group believes the 3.5 acres / 1000 population is much too suburban in nature.
- The group wanted to adopt a new standard related to both proximity and function. They wanted to be able to propose say a) a tot lot within 1,000 feet of every home, a soccer field within every 2-4 miles of each residential area, an aquatics center in every district or every other district.
- The proximity and function measure made a great deal more sense to the group than the current standard in place. The group wants to promote a realistic approach to parks and density. For example, a member of the group thought District 3 has great parks, they may not be large enough, but felt there are “6 options” close by that provide different venues. Because of the 3.5 standard, District 3 is seen as “under parked”.
- The group was not enamored with a large amount of passive open space. The group was much more interested in tot lots, soccer fields, baseball fields, and other potential amenities.
- The group felt regional parkland adjacent to neighborhood areas should be counted as parkland.
- The group was very interested in trail connections – particularly for bike and pedestrian pathways.
- The group wanted office/non-residential uses to help in providing parks/trails.

Table 3 (facilitated by Andrew Crabtree)

- Focus on trails
- Rooftop parks?

Table 4 (facilitated by Laurel Prevetti)

- Different measures for different areas, recognizing the local needs
- Accessibility and walkability
- Trails and connectivity is key
- Increase community centers: they are more important as gathering places, especially for aging population
- Count regional parks, schools, San José State University, etc.

Table 5 (facilitated by Hans Larsen)

- No discussion.

Table 6 (facilitated by Stan Ketchum)

- Private open space credits do not equal public open space
- Build public park for each development – not defer to offsite
- Trails to neighborhoods
- Trails planning with specific plans (Diridon)
- Strengthen City-School play area use/support

Table 8 (facilitated by Lee Butler)

- Trend has been smaller parks – some activities demand greater square footage – sports facilities needed (baseball, soccer, etc.)
- Review Greenprint
- Parks Department and School District partnerships – joint use facilities
 - Locate parks in SCVWD lands, PG&E power line easements, etc.
- Consider Pleasant Hills Golf Course and County Fairgrounds
- Consider global warming and Green Vision in all parts of General Plan Update
 - Native vegetation not turf in parks
- Increase Construction & Conveyance tax to support parks